



CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS

**FIRST SESSION
38th PARLIAMENT**

**Order Paper
and
Notice Paper**

No. 156

Wednesday, November 23, 2005

QUESTION

Q-259 — November 22, 2005 — Mr. Cummins (Delta—Richmond East) — With regard to the conclusion reached by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) in August 1981 that the government's energy conservation measures were a primary source of moisture damage in frame construction:

- (a) did CMHC conclude that certain energy conservation programs such as CHIP at the Department of Natural Resources (then Energy Mines and Resources) contributed to the problem and did it warn Natural Resources that their energy conservation programs were a source of the problem;
- (b) did Natural Resources acknowledge that its energy conservation programs were indeed causing moisture damage;
- (c) did Natural Resources warn the public that its energy conservation programs were a source of the problem and, if so, when and in what manner and, if not, why not;

(d) did Natural Resources immediately stop promoting such energy conservation measures and, if so, when and how did it change its program so as to avoid causing build-up of moisture in walls;

(e) did CMHC conclude that the National Research Council's National Building Code led to the construction of homes with moisture induced damage;

(f) did the CMHC President on August 27, 1981, request the National Research Council's Associate Committee on the National Building Code to "provide the focus for the consideration of the appropriate changes to the code measures and standards development" and, if so, why;

(g) did the National Research Council acknowledge that it indeed was contributing to the moisture induced damage in home construction;

(h) did the National Research Council move to immediately make the appropriate changes to the National Building Code and standards development as requested by CMHC on August 27, 1981;

(i) did CMHC, Natural Resources and the National Research Council immediately warn homeowners in British Columbia of the wet wall problem and, if not, why not;

(j) did CMHC, Natural Resources and the National Research Council publicly accept and acknowledge any responsibility for the rotting walls and necessary repairs and, if so, when and, if not, why not;

(k) did CMHC, Natural Resources and the National Research Council fund the repairs to homes with moisture induced damages and, if not, why not;

(l) did CMHC, Natural Resources and the National Research Council fund representative claims by homeowners so as to establish once and for all whether CMHC, Natural Resources and the National Research Council are legally liable for moisture induced damages caused whole or in part by these departments' energy conservation schemes and, if not, why not; and

(m) what were the results for British Columbia of each CMHC survey of the nature, extent and severity of the moisture induced problems?